

# **ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT**

## **MISSOURI PART B**



2007-2008

Submitted January 30, 2009

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education

## Table of Contents

<b>Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:</b>	1
<b>Indicator 1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.	6
<b>Indicator 2:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.	13
<b>Indicator 3:</b> Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:	15
A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.	15
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.	15
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.	15
<b>Indicator 4:</b> Rates of suspension and expulsion:	20
A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and	20
B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.	20
<b>Indicator 5:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:	24
A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;	24
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and	24
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound or hospital placements	24
<b>Indicator 6:</b> Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).	28
<b>Indicator 7:</b> Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:	29
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	29
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and	29
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	29
<b>Indicator 8:</b> Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	30
<b>Indicator 9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	33
<b>Indicator 10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	36
<b>Indicator 11:</b> Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.	38
<b>Indicator 12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	41
<b>Indicator 13:</b> Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.	44
<b>Indicator 14:</b> Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	46
<b>Indicator 15:</b> General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	49
<b>Indicator 16:</b> Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or	

because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the state. ....	53
<b>Indicator 17:</b> Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. ....	55
<b>Indicator 18:</b> Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.....	57
<b>Indicator 19:</b> Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. ....	58
<b>Indicator 20:</b> State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. ....	59

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2007-08 (Federal Fiscal Year 2007 which covers the time period from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008).

**Process used to develop the APR:** Staff from the Compliance, Effective Practices and Data Coordination sections of the Division of Special Education meet at least twice monthly throughout the year to review and analyze data related to SPP targets and determine whether SPP improvement activities are being implemented and are effective in helping the state meet its targets. Tools such as the OSEP SPP/APR Calendar are used to help the workgroup structure its activities, and an internal tool that outlines detailed action steps for improvement activities was also developed and is used regularly as a management tool. Stakeholder input is also crucial, and a draft of the APR and proposed SPP changes in targets and improvement activities are presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) prior to submission for their review and input.

**Public reporting of district data:** Public reports of 2007-08 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) website, under School Data and Statistics at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district.

**Public reporting of statewide data:** The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Special Education State Profile is posted on the DESE website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/datacoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf>. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident. In addition, the SPP and APR documents are posted on the DESE website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a special education listserv which is disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders, and these resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

**MOSIS and Core Data:** The DESE began the transition to collecting student level data during the 2007-08 school year through the Missouri Student Information System, or MOSIS. Prior to that the Core Data Collection System, a web-based data collection system with interactive edits, was used to gather data from districts. When fully implemented, MOSIS, which includes a variety of edit checks, will help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently. Most Special Education data are collected through MOSIS and these data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14.

During the 2007-08 school year, both the Core Data Collection System and the MOSIS student level submissions were used to gather data from school districts. The MOSIS student level submission will become the sole method of reporting data to DESE in the 2008-09 school year.

**IMACS:** The Division has developed a web-based general supervision management system, called IMACS – Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System. IMACS was first used by districts during the 2006-07 school year and data from the system will be used to address SPP Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15. The components of the system include improvement planning, compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews, and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by districts to submit required information to the Division for either the cyclical review process or for grant applications. IMACS is also available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district, and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements.

**Fourth cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators:** DESE began the fourth five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) in 2006-07. MSIP is the state's

accreditation system which reviews all districts during the five years of the cycle. The Division of Special Education follows the same cycle for monitoring the implementation of special education in all responsible public agencies in the state. The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much more performance based and places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most activities that are required of districts by the Division are based on the State Performance Plan indicators and whether the district met thresholds levels related to the targets established in the SPP. If a district did not meet a performance target, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct student file reviews of compliance indicators related to the performance area not met.

**Focused Monitoring Onsite Reviews:** Missouri has continued to refine the focused monitoring onsite process based on its experience with pilot focused monitoring in 2004-05 and 2005-06 and its work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). In 2007-08, five districts were selected for focused monitoring on-site reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) and/or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program). Based upon their results data, three of the five districts were identified for review in both the areas of elementary achievement and post secondary transition, and two of the five districts were identified in only the area of elementary achievement. Data analysis and hypotheses by DESE staff and Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants occurred prior to the review, and the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, file reviews and classroom observations. Districts were required to complete improvement plans and/or corrective action plans, as appropriate based upon the findings from the on-site review. The Division of Special Education's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used by the DESE Division of School Improvement for the fourth cycle of MSIP which began with the 2006-2007 school year. The MSIP and the special education onsite reviews, which are aligned with and complement each other, are combined when districts are chosen for both reviews.

**Improvement plan and scoring guide:** Improvement planning is used for both Improvement Grant application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans was developed that functions as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for MSIP purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring guide. The improvement plan is based on DESE's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and is part of the web-based systems of Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and Electronic Plans and Electronic Grants System (ePeGS). The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. Activity reports are required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. Activity reports are also required based upon the results of a focused monitoring review. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors that DESE will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan.

**State Improvement Grants (SIG):** The Division has been awarding improvement grants to districts on a competitive basis for the past two years. The improvement plan described above serves as the grant application. District training on the improvement planning with scoring guides is held in the fall of each year and is available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level, in order to promote changes leading toward improved outcomes for students with disabilities. During 2007-08, districts were awarded grants from both SIG and Part B discretionary funds. The districts submit activity reports during the year which serve as a progress report and an expenditure report.

- In May 2007, 42 districts were awarded grants in the area of Elementary Achievement. Personnel in these districts received professional development during the 2007-2008 school year to support implementation of the following: Positive Behavior Supports, Response to Intervention, Reading First, Differentiated Instruction, Co-teaching, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement, and Aimsweb.

- In addition, 28 districts were awarded funding for improvement in the post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities. Districts receiving funding provided the following professional development during the 2007-2008 school year to teachers to support implementation of the following: Transition Outcome Project (TOP), Co-teaching, Wilson Reading, Differentiated Instruction, Positive Behavior Support, Response to Intervention, Curriculum-Based Measurement, Wilson Reading, and Aimsweb.

In April 2008, 79 elementary achievement and 28 secondary transition grants were awarded for 2008-09. An additional nine elementary achievement grants were awarded using state professional development funds. The Division intends to continue awarding improvement grants as funds are available.

**Consultants:** DESE contracts with nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts. The Division of Special Education supports the following consultant positions:

- Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data-based school improvement plans. They align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans. These consultants also participate in Reading First training opportunities and collaborate with other RPDC staff to improve reading performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels in Reading First and non-Reading First schools.
- School-wide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district SW-PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, provide training, conduct self-reviews, and assist with writing and implementing corrective action plans.
- Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called “RPDC consultants” or “consultants.”

**MO Resources (MORE):** The DESE, in conjunction with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) has completed a web-based system called MO Resources (MORE). This system provides information on topics related to the SPP Indicators. The topics are: Academic Achievement, Dropout, Dispute Resolution, Graduation, LRE (preschool age), LRE (school age), Parent Involvement, Early Childhood Outcomes, Suspension and Expulsion, Post-secondary Transition, Early Intervening Services/Response To Intervention, and Disproportionality. Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-based Practice, FAQ, Definition, Exemplary, and Legal Issue & Court Ruling. This system was made available to school districts in October 2007 and can be located at the following web address: <http://www.northcentralrrc.org/sppinformationsupportsystem/index.aspx>. From January 2008 through September 2008, 1,069 hits were recorded for the MORE website.

**Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network:** The mission of Missouri School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) Network is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining school environments where the social culture and behavioral supports needed to be an effective learning environment are in place for all students. This network is comprised of a State Coordinator and thirteen regional consultants who provide building and district level support across a spectrum of implementation issues and involves regular collaboration and consultation with the OSEP-funded PBIS National Center located at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The state team is scaling-up available support to districts through two new state-wide consultant position types (Secondary and Tertiary Level Consultants and a Data/Web Consultant). The Secondary and Tertiary Level Consultants guide secondary and tertiary tier implementation for buildings that have met criteria at the universal level.

These consultants also train regional consultants to provide implementation assistance at these tiers. The Data/Web Consultant is working to formalize a cohesive system of SW-PBS data collection and review at building, district, and state level and to offer state-wide support across all implementation levels-to be available on the [www.pbissmissouri.org](http://www.pbissmissouri.org) website (tools, examples, etc). Active buildings are categorized into an implementation phase based on set criteria. The categories include: Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver, and Gold. Eighty-one buildings were recognized in June 2008 for having met the criteria at the Bronze, Silver or Gold levels. These buildings qualify as state demonstration sites who share data with the state as well as other schools. The SW-PBS State Leadership Team is in the process of developing standardized training across all levels for various audiences from bus drivers to superintendents and across all levels-building, district, regional, and state.

**Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) & State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG):** Through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funded by the U. S. Department of Education, Missouri has been researching, developing, and implementing an integrated 3-tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model includes eleven essential features. These features represent the evidence-based practices and qualities congruent with effective schools, response to intervention and successful system-change efforts. Collectively, the tiered levels of support and the essential features are integrated within the context of schools, districts and the state to form the Missouri Integrated Model. Fourteen districts representing each of the nine RPDC regions were selected to pilot this program. The MIM Kickoff was held in September 2008 for all fourteen pilot schools and the RPDCs. District planning and preparation will take place during 2008-09 with implementation beginning in 2009-10. A critical element of the pilot is the evaluation of the model and its implementation. The results of this evaluation will inform the management team regarding any needed adaptations to the model prior to statewide scale-up. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at [www.mimschools.org](http://www.mimschools.org).

**Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech Pilot:** During 2007-08, the enhancing Special Education (eSPED) with Technology Project continued preliminary work begun in 2006 with the eMINTS National Center as a proof-of-concept study. eMints is a national center that works to enhance education through professional development including in-classroom support in technology rich classrooms. eMints classroom equipment minimally includes: teacher laptop and workstation, SmartBoard and projector, scanner, printer, and digital camera, one computer for every two students and specific software. This grant was expanded in 2007-08 to include non-eMINTS classrooms in the pilot districts thus eMINTS, non-eMINTS, and ELL teachers participated in the project. The project provided text-to-speech and voice recognition software, hardware, and professional development to selected teachers in three school districts with 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students. In 2007-2008 the pilot tested the utility of text-to-speech and voice recognition software in assisting students with print disabilities as well as struggling readers not identified as having a disability to achieve higher levels of performance on reading and writing tasks. Teachers agreed the text-to-speech program benefited their students but continued to be disappointed with the voice recognition component. This project has confirmed that students given the opportunity to direct their learning with technology enabling tools will quickly master the software and be able to utilize the resources within the program to benefit their individual learning styles. Quantitative analysis of reading scores across the districts in the Year 2 classrooms confirm the trend found in Year 1 when higher Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) scores were found in participating pilot classrooms when compared with their non-participating peers. In 2007-08, the focus was not on MAP scores but on district level reading assessments. Again, an observable trend between higher student reading scores and project participation was recorded. This grant is being expanded in the 2008-09 school year to include eMINTS and Special Education classrooms in two new pilot districts. Technology will be upgraded in the eMINTS classrooms and the Special Education classrooms will receive the eMINTS technology package. Teachers will participate in training in the use of the text to speech software and introductory exposure to other types of assistive technology. Technical and professional support will continue to be provided by eMINTS staff as a component of the grant.

**SISEP:** Missouri is one of six states selected to partner with the OSEP funded State Implementation and Scaling Up of Evidence Based Practices (SISEP) center. Missouri, along with one

other state, is identified as an “emerging” state and will begin working on collaborative activities with the SISEP center during 2009.

**Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities:** The Division of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November of 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Division staff in a model for evaluating improvement activities. Using this model, division staff have developed an evaluation plan for the improvement activities for the post secondary transition cluster (indicators 1, 2, 13, 14). Changes to the improvement activities as a result of this work are reflected in the SPP submitted with this APR. A detailed evaluation plan for each indicator can be found at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>. Division staff will continue to work during 2009 to develop evaluation plans for other SPP indicators.



**Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)**

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:** Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	75.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state, with a graduation rate of 73.4% for students with disabilities, did not meet the target established for 2007-08. The targets established in the SPP were based on data that excluded the Department of Corrections (DOC), because DOC serves an adult population and does not issue diplomas. Inmates work toward earning GEDs, and therefore cannot be counted as graduates. In addition, DOC data are not included in data for all students since DOC is not considered a Local Education Agency. In the SPP, DOC data was not included in baseline data in order to best represent regular school districts' performance for use in setting targets for improvement. OSEP's response indicated that DOC data must be included in the baseline data. Targets established in the SPP were not revised as this would have artificially lowered the standard for all regular school districts in the state; however, this explains why statewide data does not meet the target established in the SPP. The second table below shows that, if DOC data were excluded, the state would be exceeding the 2007-08 target for graduation rates with a rate of 76.7%.

For the past two years, the state has included graduation and dropout data both including and excluding DOC data, however, as explained in the revision section below, the state with stakeholder input, has decided to revise targets for the future.

Graduation Rates						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	
2005-06	6,325	8,998	70.3%	58,435	85.8%	15.5%
2006-07	6,694	9,192	72.8%	60,200	86.3%	13.5%
<b>2007-08</b>	6,621	9,024	<b>73.4%</b>	61,752	85.2%	11.8%

Graduation Rates excluding DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students*		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Graduates	Number of Graduates & Dropouts	Graduation Rate	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	
2005-06	6,325	8,608	73.5%	58,435	85.8%	12.3%
2006-07	6,694	8,905	75.2%	60,200	86.3%	11.1%
2007-08	6,621	8,637	76.7%	61,752	85.2%	8.5%

Sources: All Students data from School Data and Statistics website as of 11/17/08.

Students with Disabilities data from EDEN file as of 10/27/08.

\* DOC does not report data for all students

## Formulas:

- Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate:  $\text{Number of graduates} / (\text{number of graduates} + \text{number of dropouts}) \times 100$
- All Students Graduation Rate:  $(\text{Graduates} / (9\text{-}12 \text{ Cohort Dropouts} + \text{Graduates})) \times 100$
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

Calculations for students with disabilities and all students differ due to the following:

<b>Difference in Calculations/ Reporting</b>	<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>All Students (includes students with disabilities)</b>
Collection method	Screen 12 of Core Data by district and age via MOSIS	Screen 13 of Core Data by building and grade level via MOSIS
Exiters Reported	Students on the district's Special Education child count prior to exit during the school year	All students exiting during the school year
Graduation rate calculations	$(\text{Number of graduates} / (\text{number of graduates} + \text{number of dropouts})) \times 100$ Cohort dropouts not available due to collection by age, uses total number of dropouts that school year instead Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEPs – see detail below	$(\text{Graduates} / (9\text{-}12 \text{ Cohort Dropouts} + \text{Graduates})) \times 100$ Cohort dropouts available due to collection by grade level Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEPs – see detail below
Dropout rate calculations	$(\text{Number of dropouts} / \text{Total child count ages } 14\text{-}21) \times 100$ . Total dropouts include the following exit categories: Received a Certificate, Reached Max Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out. Average enrollment not collected for students with disabilities, uses 14-21 child count as of December 1 instead	$(\text{Number of dropouts divided by average enrollment}) \times 100$ Dropout categories are the same as for students with disabilities Average enrollment is collected for all students

The following is excerpted from Missouri's guidelines for Graduation Requirements for Students in Missouri's Public Schools:

**SPECIAL POLICY CONSIDERATION FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES UNDER IDEA**

*Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years. Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner and within the spirit and intent of that requirement. Provisions include:*

1. *Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a disabled student if recommended by the IEP Committee.*
2. *Students with disabilities receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.*
3. *Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs to accommodate their disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed*

*in that same manner as students who complete the same courses without modification; however, the fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcripts.*

4. *Students with disabilities who meet the goals and objectives of their IEPs, as measured by the evaluation procedures and criteria specified in the IEPs, will have credit transcribed in accordance with the state definition of units of credit.*
5. *All students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation requirements by taking and passing regular courses without modification; taking and passing regular courses with modification; or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.*
6. *Students with disabilities who reach age 21 or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.*

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

As noted above, Missouri did not meet the established target for graduation rates when considering data that includes the Department of Corrections (DOC), however, when DOC data are excluded from the calculation, the state met, and exceeded, the target. Steady progress is evident in the graduation rates over the past three years.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Collaborate with other agencies in the state in order to impact post-secondary outcomes
  - Improve data collection in order to assess impact of services of career education and vocational rehabilitation
  - Establish and utilize the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT)
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and support use of evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
  - MORE
  - Searchable database of transition resources
  - Community of practice
  - Models of success
- Develop and disseminate curriculum on high quality transition planning
  - Online needs assessment
  - Online courses
  - Compliance/SPP 13 trainings
- Encourage districts to offer the Missouri Option program (formerly called GED Option program)
- Disseminate training on ways to engage students in the transition planning process to ensure students are involved in meaningful activities related to their transition to post-secondary life
- Continue to hold Transition Institute to disseminate information in the area of secondary transition
- Make Transition Outcomes Project (TOP) training available to districts
- Implement system of Transition Liaisons to function as a bridge between DESE and local districts
- Develop Community Transition Teams to identify community needs, identify resources and serve as a steering group for local improvement efforts

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

#### **Collaborate with other agencies in the state in order to impact post-secondary outcomes:**

In the summer of 2007, the DESE, as part of their work with the University of Kansas (KU) Transition Coalition, formed a Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT). This team is comprised of representatives of agencies within the state that impact post-secondary outcomes for Missouri students. The purpose of the MITT is to identify critical needs in the area of post-secondary transition at the state level, to share data across agencies for post-secondary transition, and to work together to create positive

post-secondary outcomes, to develop a vision for impact, to develop content training related to data from Community Resource Mapping, create an action plan, and to assist with developing a model for scaling up and sustainability.

In May 2008, the MITT participated in the NSTTAC Capacity Building Project in Charlotte, North Carolina. The project targeted areas of improvement in the area of post-secondary transition. The group continues to work toward identifying and collecting data which will allow for assessment of the impact of current and future transition activities. Over the past year, the MITT has spent time learning about the services of each member agency through site visits and presentations at meetings. Through data analysis, the MITT has identified a group focus on dropout prevention and the team will be working on developing and implementing a dropout prevention project.

**Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation:** Performance data by district and region is provided annually to technical assistance providers to enable them to identify and provide technical assistance and professional development to districts in order to improve performance in areas of need. See APR overview for related information. Technical assistance and improvement plan implementation offered through the local school improvement grants are collectively described in the following overview categories: SIG; SIG Post-Secondary Transition; Improvement Plan and Scoring Guide.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices:** A variety of resources are available, including the following:

- **MO Resources:** See APR overview Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview category labeled MO Resources (MORE).
- **Searchable Database:** In spring 2008, the KU Transition Coalition developed a searchable website of regional community resources and information related to specific transition outcome areas. The KU Transition Coalition populated the database by entering data about Rehabilitation Services and Centers for Independent Living throughout the state. Community transition teams at the local level will identify resources available within their regions and include them in the database during 2008-09. The database will be searchable by zip code, district, county, topic and agency name. The website for the database is [www.transitioncoalition.org](http://www.transitioncoalition.org).
- **Online Community of Practice:** The DESE in collaboration with the University of Kansas developed a website that houses the Missouri Transition Community of Practice (CoP) [www.missouritransition.org](http://www.missouritransition.org). In addition to the ongoing sharing and problem solving dialogue, and links to evidence-based practices and online professional development modules, three “Ask the Expert” events occurred during 2007-08. The first occurred in September 2007 with additional dates in January/February 2008, and March/April 2008. The number of participants has increased with each event, beginning in September 2007, and the most recent “Ask the Expert” event, held in October 2008, had 466 participants. Due to the success of these events, additional “Ask the Expert” events are scheduled for 2008-09. The primary focus is to ensure participants receive access to evidence-based practice, technical assistance and support in a timely, low cost manner.
- **Models of Success:** During 2007-08, an initial three districts were identified as having high quality models for providing transition services by the KU Transition Coalition and DESE. This identification was done through a nomination process. In August 2008, the Transition Coalition initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in providing transition services. This identification process includes adapting selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it is specific to Missouri. This process includes a scoring rubric regarding critical aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model will work with the transition coalition to create a description of the program. The Missouri Community of Practice will provide graphic and text information about the models on [www.transitioncoalition.org](http://www.transitioncoalition.org).

**Curriculum on High Quality Transition Planning:** Several resources relating to high quality transition planning are available and include the following:

- **Online Needs Assessment:** The online needs assessment Quality Indicators of Exemplary Transition Programs Needs Assessment Instrument (QI) was developed in 2006 and is available to districts on a voluntary basis. Districts attending the annual Transition Institute are required to complete the needs assessment and the results are used to develop action plans during the Transition Institute. Data from the needs assessment are also provided to DESE and is used to determine the technical assistance and professional development needed by the field as well as inform the MITT regarding action planning for statewide transition activities. The three areas of need identified during 2007-08 included interagency collaboration, transition assessments and compliance. The identified need for transition assessments resulted in a December 2008 training for districts.
- **Online Courses:** During 2007-08, online courses developed by the KU Transition Coalition were offered to the transition liaisons and to twenty district level personnel on a scholarship basis. The courses include:
  - a. Introduction to Transition Education and Services
  - b. Transition Assessment
  - c. Family Involvement and Student Involvement in Transition
  - d. Preparing Students for Employment and Postsecondary Education
  - e. Interagency Collaboration during Transition Planning

Participants included 15 liaisons, one transition consultant, one compliance consultant and one Vocational Rehabilitation director.

The KU Transition Coalition also developed several forms of statewide training to assist RPDCs in providing high quality, consistent training to Missouri school districts. The Transition Coalition adapted the online training module Best Practices in Transition Planning to include Missouri specific content, information, activities and resources. It utilizes the Missouri IEP form as an example to inform compliance with Indicator 13 and uses additional Missouri specific links and resources. This training was made available in March of 2008.

- **Compliance and Monitoring:** During 2007-08, the KU Transition Coalition and the DESE compliance section trained RPDC Consultants on the use of the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center's (NSTTAC) Indicator 13 checklist as well as the compliance review process for post-secondary transition indicators to ensure that training provided and the compliance review process are accurate and consistent. Training for district staff on the review process and forms was held in December of 2007. New sample IEP's addressing a diverse group of student populations continue to be developed in 2008-09. These samples are added to the training materials provided for assistance in the area of compliance. In addition, a web stream was developed by DESE for compliance issues regarding high quality transition planning. This web stream was made available to districts in September of 2007 and was developed to assure consistency of information provided to districts.

**Missouri Option Program:** The Missouri Option Program is designed to target students who have the capabilities to complete Missouri High School Graduation Requirements, but for a variety of reasons lack the credits needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. DESE is working with the Division of Career Education to better disseminate information about the program and collect data on the districts offering the program and the impact on students with disabilities.

**Training on Student Engagement:** For the past several years, RPDC Consultants have provided training to districts using the "Teaching Self-Determination Strategies for Effective Transition"

module. This self-determination training is provided to enable teachers to understand the meaning of self-determination; how to promote self-determination with students; and how to teach self-determination skills to students. Self-determination training is made available statewide to ensure that students are involved “in meaningful activities related to their transition to post-secondary life”.

During the past year, the content of this training has been incorporated into a variety of other training modules and thus will be removed from the SPP as a separate improvement activity.

**Transition Institute:** The DESE conducted a Secondary Transition Institute in June 2007 and again in July 2008. The institutes included content specific presentations and sessions as well as opportunities for district teams to meet and review needs assessment data. Districts were required to bring a team consisting of a general education and special education teacher, a counselor and an administrator. District teams left the Institute with district level actions plans for implementation. The 2008 Summer Institute was held in cooperation and collaboration with the Division of Career Education with 75 districts participating. The participants’ pre- and post-questionnaires indicated an increase in knowledge in the area of transition compliance. The evaluation data revealed high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the Institute.

Plans for future institutes include adding strands for Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Mental Health and the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT).

**Transition Outcomes Project (TOP):** The DESE contracted with Dr. Ed O’Leary in fall 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to DESE staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition is assisting with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data are collected through the TOP training. This training is designed to increase compliance with the Indicator 13 checklist, to support best practice and to build capacity. This process began with training 32 school districts in December 2007. An additional 27 districts were trained in November 2008 with evaluations indicating that over 95% of the participants found the content to be very useful and/or functional. Training to become TOP facilitators was offered to 18 Transition Liaisons and RPDC transition consultants in November 2008. These trainers will be utilized in 2008-09 to scale up the TOP program statewide. The goal is to have all districts trained on TOP by 2010-11.

**Transition Liaisons:** The Transition Liaisons are individuals selected from each RPDC region who assist in promoting transition at the “field level.” The Liaisons were chosen from among transition coordinators, secondary special education teachers and work study coordinators from Missouri school districts. The Liaisons serve as points of contact for the DESE for input into new forms, procedures and policy issues from the district level. They also preview training materials. Sixteen liaisons were selected in spring 2008 and receive ongoing training through DESE and the KU Transition Coalition. Additional liaisons will be identified in spring 2009.

**Community Transition Teams:** Each RPDC region of the state has a group of members from the local community or defined region who work together to identify available resources for the provision of post-secondary transition services in their area and upload this information to an interactive website. This team receives training from DESE and the KU Transition Coalition. They utilize the Quality Indicators Needs Assessment to identify needs within the community, complete action planning formats and data collection across a two year time period to identify changes and improvement in services. This process began in January 2008.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

Targets have been revised in the SPP as follows:

	Previous Target	Revised Target
2008-09	76.5%	74.0%
2009-10	77.5%	74.5%
2010-11	78.5%	75.0%

These changes are being made on the advice and recommendation of the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP based its advice on the fact that when they endorsed the original targets it was believed that the Department of Corrections (DOC) data would not be included. Subsequently, OSEP required that we include DOC data in the baseline, and targets are now being adjusted to account for the change in baseline. Most improvement activities have been revised to better reflect the state's five-year comprehensive plan for secondary transition as well as to reflect the Division's evaluation of all improvement activities. One improvement activity regarding training on student engagement is being removed from the SPP due to the content being incorporated into a variety of other training modules. These changes were presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:** Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	4.3% dropout rate for students with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state, with a dropout rate of 5.2% for students with disabilities, did not meet the target established for 2007-08. See detail below.

See discussion of the inclusion of data from the Department of Corrections (DOC) under Indicator 1.

Dropout Rates including DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students		Gap (Spec Ed - All)
	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-21	Dropout Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2005-06	2,673	47,466	5.6%	11,148	4.0%	1.6%
2006-07	2,685	47,062	5.7%	10,551	3.7%	2.0%
<b>2007-08</b>	2,403	45,816	<b>5.2%</b>	14,386	5.1%	0.1%

Dropout Rates excluding DOC						
Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students*		Gap (All – Spec Ed)
	Number of Dropouts	Child Count Age 14-21	Drop Out Rate	Number of Dropouts	Drop Out Rate	
2005-06	2,283	46,952	4.9%	11,148	4.0%	0.9%
2006-07	2,211	46,555	4.7%	10,551	3.7%	1.0%
2007-08	2,016	45,261	4.5%	14,386	5.1%	-0.6%

Sources: All Students data from School Data and Statistics website as of 11/17/08.

Students with Disabilities data from EDEN submission as of 10/27/08.

\* DOC does not report data for all students

**Formulas:**

- Students with Disabilities Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Total child count ages 14-21
- All Students Dropout Rate: Number of dropouts / Average enrollment
- Dropouts include exit categories Received a Certificate, Reached Maximum Age, Moved Not Known to be Continuing and Dropped Out

See information under Indicator 1 for a description of who is considered a dropout for students with disabilities and all students. In short, the definitions of dropout for both groups are the same.



**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The state did not meet the 2007-08 target for the dropout rate, however the dropout rate excluding data from the Department of Corrections has improved consistently over the past three years. The state's dropout rate is largely due to high dropout rates for two large urban districts in the state. The DESE is working closely with these two districts through improvement grants and targeted technical assistance in the area of post-secondary transition. Grant funds for these two districts are supporting the implementation of a number of activities and professional development including the following: Quality Eligibility Determination trainings for teachers and administrators, co-teaching, differentiated instruction and Response to Intervention. The Division is monitoring the implementation of these strategies through the submission of semi-annual activity reports which are also used for reimbursement of grant activity expenditures.

Other technical assistance for these districts includes specialized training for the Transition Outcomes Project (TOP), participation in the summer Transition Institute, Consultant/DESE training focusing on the SPP 13 checklist, and RPDC Consultants working directly with district leadership to conduct a needs assessment, and provide ongoing coaching and evaluation of improvement activities.

See Indicator 1 for information on improvement activities completed.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

Targets have been revised in the SPP as follows:

	Previous Target	Revised Target
2008-09	4.0%	5.0%
2009-10	3.9%	4.9%
2010-11	3.8%	4.8%

These changes are being made on the advice and recommendation of the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The SEAP based its advice on the fact that when they endorsed the original targets it was believed that the Department of Corrections (DOC) data would not be included. Subsequently, OSEP required that we include DOC data in the baseline, and targets are now being adjusted to account for the change in baseline.

See Indicator 1 for revisions to improvement activities.

These revisions were presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs)}}{\text{total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size in the State}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(b)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ );
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(c)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ );
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(d)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ ); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(e)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ ).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent =  $\left[ \frac{(b + c + d + e)}{(a)} \right]$ .

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(b)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ );
- c. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(c)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ );
- d. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(d)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ ); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent =  $\left[ \frac{(e)}{(a)} \right] \text{ times } 100$ ).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above.

Overall Percent =  $\left[ \frac{(b + c + d + e)}{(a)} \right]$ .

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	Percent of districts meeting AYP: 34% Participation rate for children with IEPs: 95% Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 51.0% Math – 45.0%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state met the 2007-08 target for Indicator 3B (participation), but did not meet the targets established for 3A (AYP) or 3C (proficiency).

The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8. At the high school level Communication Arts is assessed at grade 11 and Mathematics is assessed at grade 10. Science assessments occur in grades 5, 8, and 11.

Public reports of assessment data are available online at  
[http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school\\_data.html](http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html).

**A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup.**

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2008 were 51.0% for Communication Arts and 45.0% for Mathematics.

Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2006	Communication Arts	87	243	35.8%
	Mathematics	153	242	63.2%
	Combined – CA & Math	79	245	32.2%
2007	Communication Arts	32	233	13.7%
	Mathematics	69	230	30.0%
	Combined – CA & Math	25	235	10.6%
2008	Communication Arts	72	319	22.6%
	Mathematics	103	324	31.8%
	Combined – CA & Math	60	327	<b>18.3%</b>

\* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes was 50 for 2006 and 2007, and 30 for 2008.

**B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.**

**MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities**

	Total	Regular MAP Assessment	MAP-Alternate Assessment	Participation Rate	Absent	Not Assessed/Invalid Results
2006 Communication Arts	71,345	67,255	3,613	99.3%	374	103
2006 Mathematics	73,074	68,928	3,627	99.3%	423	96
2007 Communication Arts	69,622	65,083	4,090	99.4%	328	121
2007 Mathematics	71,069	66,479	4,103	99.3%	373	114
<b>2008 Communication Arts</b>	66,425	61,469	4,717	<b>99.6%</b>	183	56
<b>2008 Mathematics</b>	67,754	62,636	4,826	<b>99.6%</b>	226	66

Source: Table 6 of Section 618 reporting to OSEP

Not Assessed are students who were to take the MAP-Alternate, but did not receive a reportable score.

**C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.**

“Proficiency” includes the top two of four achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

**MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities**

	2008 Total	2008 Proficient - Regular Assessment	2008 Proficient - Alternate Assessment	2008 Proficiency Rate	2007 Proficiency Rate	2006 Proficiency Rate
Comm Arts Grade 3	10,503	2,087	620	25.8%	24.4%	22.9%
Comm Arts Grade 4	10,443	1,879	605	23.8%	23.6%	21.4%
Comm Arts Grade 5	9,886	1,744	563	23.3%	20.8%	18.3%
Comm Arts Grade 6	9,440	1,290	403	17.9%	16.2%	14.2%
Comm Arts Grade 7	9,288	1,051	429	15.9%	14.1%	11.8%
Comm Arts Grade 8	9,006	885	396	14.2%	11.3%	10.6%
Comm Arts Grade 11	7,620	371	293	8.7%	9.8%	9.8%
<b>Comm Arts Total</b>	66,186	9,307	3,309	<b>19.1%</b>	17.6%	15.9%
Mathematics Grade 3	10,498	2,562	614	30.3%	29.6%	28.8%
Mathematics Grade 4	10,443	2,310	588	27.8%	27.0%	25.2%
Mathematics Grade 5	9,885	1,830	543	24.0%	23.9%	20.8%
Mathematics Grade 6	9,431	1,684	491	23.1%	20.6%	17.5%
Mathematics Grade 7	9,270	1,418	485	20.5%	17.4%	14.0%
Mathematics Grade 8	9,002	973	468	16.0%	14.2%	12.9%
Mathematics Grade 10	8,933	808	513	14.8%	11.5%	10.3%
<b>Mathematics Total</b>	67,462	11,585	3,702	<b>22.7%</b>	20.9%	18.7%

Source: Table 6 of Section 618 reporting to OSEP

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The percent of students with disabilities who scored proficient or advanced on the Missouri Assessment Program increased from 2007 to 2008 for all subject areas and grade levels except Communication Arts Grade 11. This is continuing the trend seen from 2006 to 2007. As indicated on the chart above, these increases averaged about 8.5% overall, and for some grade levels, exceeded 20% gains. This is seen as significant progress for students with disabilities, despite the fact that the targets were not met. The targets are those set for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) purposes for all students.

The percent of districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) increased in 2008; however, this change is largely due to the change in the minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB. The minimum cell size went from 50 to 30, and a larger proportion of districts with cells between 30 and 50 made AYP than the districts with 50 or more students with disabilities assessed. With the proficiency targets increasing at a much higher rate than the actual proficiency rates, it is very unlikely that the percentage of districts meeting AYP would increase from year to year.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Form and support electronic communities of practice focused on instructional practices for all educators
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans.
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Disseminate training on appropriate accommodation decisions and usage
- Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech pilot project which demonstrates the utility of text-to-speech and voice recognition (tts/vr) software to assist students with print disabilities achieve higher levels of performance on reading and writing tasks. Current grant will be expanded to include non-eMINTS classrooms in pilot districts in 2007-08
- State Personnel Development Grant/Work with a stakeholder group to develop and implement Missouri Integrated Model including essential elements from researched-based 3-tiered models

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Communities of Practice:** The communities of practice (CoP) have been discontinued based on survey responses from the CoP members that indicated their preference to obtain information from other sources rather than through a CoP. Technical assistance on this topic is available to districts through the RPDCs, the DESE website and the Special Education listserv.

**Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation:** The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for state assessment performance targets complete an improvement plan to address poor performance. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze assessment data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, will address it through an objective and strategies.

In addition to the improvement planning component of the self-assessment process, districts can apply for competitive grants in the area of elementary achievement through the development of an improvement plan. See the APR overview for more information on the activities implemented by grant recipients.

The Division makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. These data, which include data on state assessments, are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices:** See APR overview. Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources (MORE) and Consultants.

**Disseminate Training:** See APR overview. Dissemination of trainings on accommodations and usage are accomplished through the work of the regional Special Education Consultants described in the overview category labeled Consultants.

**eMINTS:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS)

**State Personnel Development Grant:** See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No changes were made to targets in the SPP. The improvement activity regarding communities of practice is being removed from the SPP as discussed above. This revision was presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 4:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year}}{\text{\# of districts in the State}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity}}{\text{\# of districts in the State}} \right] \times 100$ .

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	<p>A: 1.2% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates</p> <p>B: Not applicable</p>

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

With 0% districts identified with a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates, the state met the established target of 1.2% of districts identified.

Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

Across districts, a mean and standard deviation of the ratios were calculated. Districts with a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation are considered to have a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines the calculations for 2007-08.

**Discipline Data Summary for Students with Disabilities (SWD) and Nondisabled for 2007-08**

	(A) Count of Discipline Incidents for SWD	(B) Count of Discipline Incidents for Non- disabled Students	(C) IEP Child Count Ages 3- 22	(D) Total Enrollment less child count = Non- disabled	(E) Discipline Rate per 100 SWD	(F) Discipline Rate per 100 Non- disabled Students	(G) Ratio of Rates for SWD:Non- disabled
All Districts	5,035	15,024	138,306	778,908	3.64	1.93	1.89
Districts with 5 or more Incidents for Students with IEPs	4,734	13,347	101,512	568,959	4.66	2.35	1.99
Mean of Ratios							2.68
Standard Deviation of Ratios							1.70
Mean + 1 Standard Deviation							4.38

Calculations:

$E = (A / C) \times 100$  meaning, on average, there are 4.66 incidents per 100 students with disabilities for districts with five or more incidents for students with disabilities

$F = (B / D) \times 100$  meaning, on average, there are 2.35 incidents per 100 non-disabled students

$G = E / F$  meaning that the discipline rate for students with disabilities is 1.99 times that of nondisabled students

Source: Discipline Incident Data from Screen 09 of Core Data (Discipline)

Once the preliminary list of districts is determined, other factors are taken into account to finalize the list of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines these factors:

<b>Factors Determining Significant Discrepancies</b>	<b>Number of Districts</b>
Districts with a 2007-08 ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation	16
Of these, the districts remaining after exclusion due to low discipline rates (Districts with an average number of incidents per 100 students less than 2.0 and 1.0, for disabled and nondisabled students, respectively)	15 (one removed due to low discipline rates)
Of these, the districts remaining with ratios greater than the mean + one standard deviation for two consecutive years (2006-07 and 2007-08)	0 (15 removed due to first year identification only)
Of these, the number remaining after data verification conducted	0
Number of districts with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates	0
<b>Percent of districts with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for 2007-08</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Five districts were notified of noncompliance during 2006-07 based on reviews conducted in spring 2006. The 2006-07 APR indicated that four of the five districts had corrected the noncompliance within one year of the date of the report, and that the 12 month timeline was not yet up for the fifth district. OSEP referenced that fifth district in the response to the 2006-



07 APR. Correction for the final district was also completed within the 12 month requirement resulting in all districts with noncompliance identified in 2006-07 having cleared the noncompliance within 12 months of the date of the reports.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

For the 2007-08 school year (based on 2006-07 and 2007-08 data) no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. This resulted in the state meeting the target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates.

If districts had been identified, the review process would have included three basic components that address the requirement to review and, if appropriate require affected LEAs to revise their policies, procedures and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior supports and procedural safeguards:

1. Monitoring staff review district policies and procedures related to discipline.
2. Monitoring staff conduct file reviews of students who had been long-term suspended or expelled to determine if districts are in compliance with respect to the discipline related requirements of IDEA. The indicators reviewed include such topics as provision of the procedural safeguard notice, as appropriate; conducting manifestation determination meetings; development of IEPs that document provision of services to students who are long term suspended or expelled; review/development of Behavior Intervention Plans and Functional Behavior Assessments; consideration of positive behavioral interventions and supports in the IEP.
3. Monitoring staff conduct interviews of regular and special education staff to assess their level of understanding of procedures and practices in place within district buildings related to discipline of students with and without disabilities. For example, the file reviews demonstrate documentation in the IEP, but interviews shed more light on IEP implementation practices.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Embed district analysis of policies, procedures and practices as a part of the Self-Assessment for monitoring and the Model Program Evaluation materials
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Develop and implement use of demonstration sites for SW-PBS in order to demonstrate effectiveness in reducing rates of suspension and expulsion

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**District Self-Assessment:** In 2008, the IMACS system was revised to include a component to collect data for the discipline reviews. This system will be used beginning in 2009-2010 to implement the program evaluation regarding discipline that is discussed in the State Performance Plan. Subsequent improvement plans or corrective action plans will be managed through the system as well.

**Targeted Technical Assistance/Improvement Plan Implementation:** Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. If a district has one year of data that suggests discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, the districts, along with their RPDC Consultants, are notified. Any potential issues which might result in the district being determined to have significant discrepancies in the second year can then be identified and addressed. Any districts determined to have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates are reviewed and, if necessary, required to develop an improvement plan and/or corrective action plan.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-Based Practices:** See APR overview Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources and Consultants.

**Demonstration Sites:** Eighty-one buildings were recognized and qualified as demonstration sites for 2007-08. This number increased from 35 in 2006-07. See APR overview under the category labeled Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network for more information. During 2007-08, a statewide SW-PBS data collection system was implemented. Discipline office referral and student assistance referral data is being collected from all schools implementing SW-PBS, which will allow for the evaluation of impact of this model. A response to intervention webpage has also been established. It is available through the DESE General Education and Special Education websites. This page offers sites across the state that have been recognized for successfully implementing 3-tiered approaches, whether behavioral or academic.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound or hospital placements

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day (Column A)) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day (Column C)) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound or hospital placements (Columns D, E and F) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class $\geq$ 80% of the day: 59.0% Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class $<$ 40% of the day: 10.8% Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.4%

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state met the target for Indicator 5B. The targets for Indicators 5A or 5C were not met.

The official language for this indicator refers to the amount of time spent removed from, or outside, the regular class, however, due to a change in the data collection, the "outside" language has been translated to "inside" language for this APR. Example: "Outside regular class less than 21% of the day" translates to "Inside regular class at least 80% of the day."

## Special Education Placement Data for ages 6-21

	2006-07		2007-08	
	#	%	#	%
<b>Inside Regular Class <math>\geq</math> 80% (5A)</b>	70,321	55.8%	<b>70,011</b>	<b>57.1%</b>
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	34,316	27.2%	32,431	26.4%
<b>Inside Regular Class &lt; 40% (5B)</b>	13,414	10.6%	<b>12,279</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
Separate School	3,970	3.2%	3,856	3.1%
Homebound/Hospital	655	0.5%	698	0.6%
Residential Facility	7	0.0%	5	0.0%
<b>Total Separate (5C)</b>	4,632	3.7%	<b>4,559</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
Correctional Facilities	907	0.7%	1,051	0.9%
Parentally-Placed Private School	2,401	1.9%	2,332	1.9%
Total School Age	125,991	100.0%	122,663	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The data above indicate that the state did not meet the targets established for the 2007-08 school year for Inside Regular Class  $\geq$  80% (5A) or separate settings (5C). The state met the 2007-08 target for Inside Regular Class < 40% (5B). While the target for 5A was not met, the percent of students in this category increased from 2006-07. Also, while the target for “Separate” placements was not met, and the percentage did not change from the previous year, the number of students in these placements decreased.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Identify, encourage and support demonstration sites for co-teaching, inclusion, differentiated instruction, SW-PBS and RTI
- Targeted technical assistance to districts not meeting state targets. Implementation of district level improvement plans
- Identify and disseminate evidence-based practices/strategies for improving performance for this indicator
- Collaborate with other department initiatives to promote co-teaching, inclusion and differentiated instruction i.e. Teaching and Learning Conference, Professional Learning Communities, Reading First, High Schools that Work, etc.
- State Personnel Development Grant/Work with a stakeholder group to develop and implement Missouri Integrated Model including essential elements from researched-based 3-tiered models
- eMINTS Text-to-Speech pilot project demonstrates the utility of text-to-speech and voice recognition (tts/vr) software to assist students with print disabilities achieve higher levels of performance on reading and writing tasks. Current grant will be expanded to include non-eMINTS classrooms in pilot districts in 2007-08.
- Revise co-teaching module to adopt Marilyn Friend strategies and training materials. Adapt the face-to-face training for web-based delivery

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Demonstration Sites:** Demonstration sites have been established for exemplary School-wide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) Schools. See APR overview (page 6) under the category labeled Missouri School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Network. A response to intervention webpage has also been established and additional resources are added to the website regularly. The information is accessible through both the DESE General Education and Special Education websites. This page offers sites across the state that have been recognized for successfully implementing 3-tiered approaches, whether behavioral or academic. The Division collaborated with Dr. Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri to develop a two part RtI overview available online and in DVD format and provided for an opportunity for

“ask the expert” questions from the field. The overview is available at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/EffectivePractices/calender0607.html>.

Additionally the Department across divisions promoted three-tiered models of intervention by showcasing successful school districts at several state-wide conferences sponsored by various stakeholders (school boards association, superintendents' organization, general education and special education administrators and teachers).

**Targeted Technical Assistance:** The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) targets complete an improvement plan. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and strategies.

The Division makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. These data are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance. RPDC Consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts, using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education. In addition, the DESE-supported Co-teaching module, based on the trainings of Marilyn Friend has been revised and disseminated during the 2007-2008 school year.

Division staff are working with e-Learning for Educators to make training modules accessible via the web.

**Identify and Disseminate Evidence-based Practices:** See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources (MORE).

**Collaborate with other department initiatives:** Collaboration has continued between department initiatives in the form of planning and working with districts to begin implementation of Missouri Integrated Model design. See APR overview under the category labeled Missouri Integrated Model. The Division of Special Education has also collaborated by contributing funding to support regional consultants who provide assistance implementing Professional Learning Communities.

**State Personnel Development Grant:** See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.

**eMints:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS)

**Co-Teaching:** On Feb 6-7, 2008, Division staff attended a Co-Teaching workshop conducted by Dr. Marilyn Friend and hosted by the St. Louis RPDC. The workshop centered on the characteristics of positive co-teaching environments and the steps used in creating supportive educational philosophy among administrators, co-teaching teams, and co-workers in buildings and districts. Dr. Marilyn Friend's Co-Teaching materials have been adopted as a learning module by the RPDC Consultants. A DVD on co-teaching was also produced and provided to the RPDCs to use in trainings.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

Targets have been revised in the SPP for 5A, 5B and 5C as follows:

	5A Previous Target	5A Revised Target	5B Previous Target	5B Revised Target	5C Previous Target	5C Revised Target
2008-09	59.5%	58.5%	10.7%	10.4%	3.35%	3.60%
2009-10	60.0%	59.0%	10.6%	10.3%	3.25%	3.55%
2010-11	60.5%	59.5%	10.5%	10.2%	3.20%	3.50%

We are concerned with the data this indicator focuses on, as the data are based on individualized decisions on placement by IEP teams, and those teams' decisions should not be influenced by how the decision for that individual student will affect the districts meeting the state target or the effect on

statewide data on this indicator. In the absence of evidence of improper considerations, procedures, or process, which would justify a closer look at a particular school district, or perhaps on the state as a whole, this indicator produces data that are not meaningful. Our current data on its face does not indicate any concerns for us; the percentages appear to be in line with national data and do not appear to reflect systemic concerns from a local school district or a state-wide perspective. In other words, we believe, based on data and monitoring, that the current percentages do not reflect improper LRE decisions. Particularly in a state like Missouri, where the requirements for separate school placement are quite stringent (due to a court decision in the mid-1990's), we feel confident that separate placements are not occurring unless they are truly appropriate placements.

In addition to several improvement activities that were added for this indicator in the February 2008 SPP update, one additional activity regarding standards-based IEPs has been added in the February 2009 SPP update. During the past year, the state has, in collaboration with North Central and Mountain Plains Regional Resource Centers, developed and disseminated training on developing and implementing standards-based IEPs (SB-IEP). Two trainings were held for 320 special education teachers, process coordinators, Directors of Special Education, regional special education consultants and state staff in June and October. On November 10, a special webinar training was conducted on SB-IEPs specifically for administrators with approximately 130 participants. Workshop and webinar evaluations regarding the content of the trainings were very positive. The state plans to continue to disseminate information on SB-IEPs through a variety of means, including webinars, regional trainings and presentations at workshops and conferences.

These revisions were presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
--------------------------------------

**Indicator 6:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

<p><b>Measurement:</b> Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	Not applicable due to data collection change. See the Missouri SPP.

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Per OSEP instructions, due to federal data collection changes, states need not report on this indicator for the 2007-08 school year. New baseline data and targets will need to be established in the future.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

Not applicable

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

Not applicable

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

For each of

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:
  - a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning
  - b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
  - c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
  - d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
  - e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
All Years	To be established in February 2010 update of the SPP

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

See Missouri State Performance Plan at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

See Missouri State Performance Plan at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

See Missouri State Performance Plan at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 8:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	72.5% of parents will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Missouri, at 72.3% of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, did not meet the target established for the 2007-08 school year.

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting the 524 school districts in Missouri on a five-year review cycle. MSIP reviews are conducted each year for approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 524 districts as well as other responsible public agencies. These reviews include the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys are used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The surveys are sent to all parents in the school districts.

**Survey Instrument:** The complete MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ) can be found at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.pdf>.

The MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire contains two items directly related to this indicator:

- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement.
- The school encourages parents to be involved.

If parents agree or strongly agree with both, then they are counted as being in agreement with this SPP indicator.

The table below shows the rates of agreement with both items for parents of students with disabilities. Results from all respondents and results from a derived representative sample are provided.

The parent survey asks for demographic data, including basic household information, race, age, education level and income, among others.

The University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) has an existing model for constructing a "state sample" from Advance Questionnaire data. The model is based on two criteria: Percent Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL), and Minority status (Minority=Black, Hispanic, Asian; Majority=White). The first step determines the FRL characteristic of each school building in the state and divides them into three groups. The second step determines the overall student enrollments, as well as

the Minority/Majority enrollments at the state level, within each of the above FRL categories. This produces a stratified sampling scheme at the state level which contains six cells:

FRL	Minority	Majority
Less Than 33%	cell 1	cell 2
33% to 54%	cell 3	cell 4
55% or More	cell 5	cell 6

**Valid and reliable data:** A sample of 2,001 Special Education parents was drawn using the above sampling scheme. The results from the sample were slightly less than the results from all respondents shown below (71.2% for sample and 72.3% for all respondents). The differences in the percents in agreement are not significant, thereby establishing the reliability of the data. The validity of the data is ensured through use of the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire, which has been determined by OSEDA to be a valid instrument for gathering data from parents.

#### Results of Parent Survey 2007-08

	Agree	Not Agree	Total
2007-08 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,077 (72.3%)	1,560 (27.7%)	5,637 (100.0%)
2006-07 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:

The state did not meet the target established for the 2007-08 school year, but the data showed improvement over the previous year.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Determine methodology/criteria and identify districts with good parental involvement. Provide incentive for districts to serve as model districts.
- Include parent involvement as part of scoring rubric for improvement plans (involvement in needs assessment, activity's potential to strengthen parent involvement)
- Develop five questions for voluntary district use on the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire
- Make NCSEAM parent survey available to districts for voluntary use. Consider requiring the use of the survey if district's MSIP AQ data below target, to assist district in improvement planning efforts

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Identification of parent involvement models:** This activity was included in a contract with the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT), but due to staffing and contract changes, has not been completed. This will be re-visited when preparing the 2009-10 contract to determine if there is a need to continue with this activity. This is also the case for the third and fourth improvement activities listed above.

**Improvement Plan Scoring Rubric:** Parent involvement is included as part of the scoring rubric for improvement plans. Parents are included in the stakeholder group to develop the needs assessment. In addition, activities are scored on the potential to strengthen parent involvement, although not all activities lend themselves to parent involvement. This has been completed and the improvement activity will be removed from the SPP.

**NCSEAM Parent Involvement Training:** On August 13, 2008, the Division of Special Education made available to districts a Parent Involvement Training workshop provided by NCSEAM. This workshop included an overview of Indicator 8 and seven modules that have been developed based on evidence based practice that if applied will likely improve schools' performance on this indicator. These modules include: General Communication Strategies, Parent Friendly Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Practices, Home-School Note, Reading Strategies, Mathematics Strategies, Homework Strategies and

Behavior Strategies. Upon completion of the workshops, participants will be familiar with the individual components of each module and how this information might best be disseminated at a local level. This information has been disseminated statewide for use by all districts.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets in the SPP. One improvement activity has been removed. See above for explanation.

Since DESE contracts with the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide information to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers, an improvement activity to collaborate with MPACT has been added to the SPP. The following are examples of trainings and resources that result from DESE's collaboration with MPACT.

**RPDC Special Education Improvement Consultants training:** In June 2008, MPACT provided an overview to the RPDC Improvement Consultants of MPACT training modules and activities available for districts to use. With this knowledge, the consultants are able to inform districts about the modules and activities as the districts are writing improvement plans.

**Bi-weekly e-newsletter:** MPACT prepares and disseminates a bi-weekly e-newsletter via web and listserv. This newsletter includes information on disability resources, Parent Mentor recruitment announcements, volunteer requests for the Educational Surrogate Parent Program, and information on the MPACT website.

**Online resource packets:** MPACT is currently developing online resource packets that include linkages to credible state and national resources, as well as fact sheets on tiered intervention models.

**Training module:** In collaboration with Project Access, MPACT developed a training module for Parents of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). This module includes the IEP process, evaluations, and ASD specific information. This training is available for presentation to professionals and families and as a train-the-trainer workshop for districts.

These revisions were presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

**Indicator 9:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state met the 2007-08 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state's identification method uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for over-representation or less than 0.25 for under representation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

**Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"**

Risk Ratio	Cell size
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 0.25 for under representation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 20 in racial/ethnic group</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)</li> </ul>

Data for all districts/LEAs are examined every year. The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria for two consecutive years and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. As stated previously, districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)
2007-08 identification using data from 2006-07 & 2007-08	0 districts under and 0 districts over in any race/ethnicity category

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

If districts had been identified, the review process would consist of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are more than 80% below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education. For example, if a district file review found that 75% of compliance indicators were in compliance for black special education students, and 96% of compliance indicators were in compliance for special education students of other race/ethnicities, then the 75% and the 96% is compared. 75 is 78% of 96, which is less than the 80% acceptable difference, and the district would be found to have inappropriate identification of black students with disabilities.

As indicated in the table above, in 2007-08 no districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2006-07 and 2007-08, therefore no reviews were conducted resulting in no districts with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

**0% of districts (0 / 556 = 0%)** in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that were the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation. See Indicator 10 for information on the review process directed towards specific disability categories.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The state met the 2007-08 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Correction of noncompliance:** There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2006-07; therefore no correction was required.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Review/revise existing procedures for identification of districts and the review of district procedures, policies and practices
- Provide training and information to districts on the state’s process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation
- Implement revised review process
- Identify and disseminate training and technical assistance resources
- Provide support for districts identified with inappropriate identification through state or national conferences
- Include disproportionality review component in the web-based IMACS system

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

**Review/revise existing procedures and implement revised review process:** During 2007-08, the Division of Special Education revised the process for identifying districts with disproportionate representation and the process for reviewing the procedures, policies and practices of those districts in order to determine if there is inappropriate identification of students with disabilities by racial/ethnic groups. The method for identifying districts is described above and in the SPP. The review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination.

**Provide information on identification and review process to districts:** The initial identification is based on the Special Education child count and district enrollment data. The process for identification of districts is included in various trainings regarding Special Education data and compliance such as New Directors of Special Education Institute, Special Education Administrators Conference, webinars, and Special Education monitoring training. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are assigned a special education staff supervisor to assist them with the monitoring process.

**Identify and Disseminate Training and Technical Assistance Resources:** See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources.

**Include disproportionality review component in the web-based IMACS system:** The disproportionality review process was built into the IMACS system during summer/fall 2007 and is being used to review districts identified with disproportionate representation of students in special education. This improvement activity has been completed and noted as such in the SPP.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP. As noted above, one improvement activity regarding IMACS has been completed.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

**Indicator 10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state met the 2007-08 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See information in APR Indicator 9 for a description of the methodology used to identify and review districts with disproportionate representation. The table below summarizes the criteria used for identifying under and over representation for all racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

**Criteria/Definition of "Disproportionate Representation"**

Risk Ratio	Cell size
Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation OR Less than 0.25 for under representation	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group AND At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all districts are examined every year. The following table displays the numbers of districts meeting the criteria for 2007-08 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation for each disability category. As stated previously, districts are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)
2007-08 identification using data from 2006-07 & 2007-08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLD: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• Autism: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• Sp/Lang: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• ED: 2 districts with overrepresentation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• MR: 4 districts with overrepresentation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category</li> <li>• OHI: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category</li> </ul>

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (Core Data Screen 16).

Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Mental Retardation (MR), and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

As indicated in the table above, for 2007-08, six districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2006-07 and 2007-08, two in the area of Emotional Disturbance and four in the area of Mental Retardation, all cases of overrepresentation. The reviews of these districts conducted in 2007 revealed that the disproportionate representation was not a result of inappropriate identification.

The district review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percents in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are more than 80% below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education. For example, if a district file review found that 75% of compliance indicators were in compliance for black MR students, and 96% of compliance indicators were in compliance for MR students of other race/ethnicities, then the 75% and the 96% are compared. 75 is 78% of 96, which is less than the 80% acceptable difference, and the district would be found to have inappropriate identification of black students in the MR disability category.

**0% of districts (0 / 556 = 0%)** in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Correction of Previous Noncompliance:** As reported in the previous APR, seven districts were reviewed in December 2007. None of the seven districts were found to have disproportionate representation of students with disabilities as a result of inappropriate identification. The reviews did result in three of the seven districts having a corrective action plan due to findings of noncompliance across all student files reviewed, however the noncompliance was not related to the disproportionality issues. All three districts were timely corrected and verified within one year of notification.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The state met the 2007-08 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See Indicator 9 for a discussion of improvement activities completed.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP, with the exception of a completion of one improvement activity as noted in Indicator 9.



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Indicator 11:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a, but not included in, b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b + c) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated and have eligibility determined within 60 days

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, evaluations were completed within timelines 97.1% of the time.

The State of Missouri uses the 60 day timeline for completion of initial evaluations which is the same as the federal timeline; however Missouri regulations allow for an extension of the timeline if there are exceptional circumstances such as delays due to family or child illness or school delays due to inclement weather or extended school breaks.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60 days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

These data were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible Y/N
- Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
  - Acceptable reason Y/N

Verification of the district reported evaluation timeline data was completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned DESE staff.

The file review process included checking the 60 day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the districts included initial evaluation timelines which were not within 60 days, the following criteria were accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather
- Agency vacation days
- Child's absence because of illness
- Summer break
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

Delays were considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions were not acceptable or if the districts failed to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Year	Number with consent to evaluate	Number within 60 day timeline	Number > 60 days with acceptable reason	Number within 60 days or with acceptable reason	Percent within acceptable timelines
2007-08 Eligible	3,289	3,012	185	3,197 (c)	97.2%
2007-08 Not Eligible	985	887	65	952 (b)	96.6%
2007-08 Total	4,274 (a)	3,899	250	4,149	<b>97.1%</b>

Calculation =  $((b + c) / a) \times 100$  where a=the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received; b=the number determined not eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days or with acceptable reason; and c=the number determined eligible whose evaluations were completed within 60 days or with acceptable reason.

Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 116 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2007-08. A total of 111 of the 116 districts conducted initial evaluations during the year. Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.

Year	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.7%	94.0%	97.1%

The number of days past the 60 day timeline ranged from one day to 107 days, with two-thirds of the delays due to acceptable reasons. Approximately 80% of the delays were 20 days or less with 57% of the delays 10 days or less and 37% of the delays 5 days or less. The longest unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable were due to lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks or that legitimate reasons did not explain the entire delay.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Three districts had findings of noncompliance issued in 2006-07. Those districts were all timely corrected and verified within one year of notification.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

While not meeting the target of 100%, the comparison for school years 2006-07 to 2007-08 shows an increase of more than three percent, from 94.0% to 97.1% within acceptable timelines.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance and training to determine causes of delayed evaluations and to determine strategies to resolve failure to meet timelines:
  - Identify districts with systemic non-compliance on timelines annually.
  - Notify RPDC compliance consultants of those districts annually.
  - RPDC compliance consultants work with the identified districts to assist in the correction of non-compliance
  - Require training on evaluation procedures in corrective action plans
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines. The topic will be addressed in the following ways:
  - Self assessment training
  - Special Education Administrators Conference
  - New Director's Training
  - Web stream Presentations
  - Technical Assistance through RPDC consultants and DESE Special Education Staff

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

**Targeted technical assistance:** State Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants worked with Division of Special Education Compliance supervisors to target the districts who needed assistance in meeting the 60 day timeline for completing initial evaluations. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of 60 day timelines. Upon notification, the RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they developed strategies to correct the non-compliance.

**Ongoing training and technical assistance:** Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is required to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies completing the evaluation process within 60 calendar days. Acceptable reasons for an extension to the 60 day timelines are reviewed during the self-assessment training also.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding the 60 day timeline for evaluation, compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the New Director's Training.

The Division of Special Education website has web stream presentations that provide training on the 60 day timeline requirement. Finally, listserv messages by numerous Division staff and webinar presentations by Assistant Commissioner, Heidi Atkins Lieberman, remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for who parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Account for children included in a, but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

**Actual Target Data for 2006-07:**

With 88.6% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2007-08, Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, but showed significant improvement over the previous year.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of C to B transition timelines, districts, as part of a self-assessment for special education monitoring, were required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

Data for 2007-08 were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
  - Acceptable reason Y/N

The information is reviewed by Compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments.

Reasons given for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development include:

- Late referral from Part C
- Parent/child unavailability, holidays and child illness
- Districts delaying evaluation until 3rd birthday. Misunderstanding by districts that IEP has to be in place by 3rd birthday, not just evaluation started
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

For the purpose of this indicator the only acceptable reason for exceeding the timeline was failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner.

#### Part C to Part B Referrals

	2007-08
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	263
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible	21
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays (196 children) and eligible children for whom parents did not give consent to evaluate in a timely manner but the IEP was implemented within required timelines after receiving parental consent (6 children)	202
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation of initial services	14
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday	26
Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible) = c / (a-b-d)	<b>88.6%</b>

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 116 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2007-08. A total of 46 of the 116 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Year	2006-07	2007-08
Percent within acceptable timelines	80.3%	88.6%

Of the 26 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, 17 had the IEP in place within one month of turning three, and all had an IEP in place within three months of the third birthday. The longest delays were 88 days due to scheduling difficulties and school holidays and snow days and 81 days due to the continuation of Part C services through the summer and past the child's third birthday. Most of the delays were due to the inability to contact the family or because of late referrals from Part C.

The districts found out of compliance with this indicator will be required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance within one year of the date of notification.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Four districts had findings of noncompliance issued in 2006-07. Those districts were all timely corrected and verified within one year of notification.

#### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006-07:

The comparison for school years 2006-07 to 2007-08 shows a significant increase from 80.3% to 88.6% within acceptable timelines. Nevertheless, the 100% target was not met and, as indicated in the

improvement activities for this indicator, technical assistance is being provided to districts regarding compliance in the area of Part C to Part B transition.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Finalize and disseminate Part C to B Transition Module for early intervention and early childhood staff
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts who received Corrective Action Plans related to C to B Transition
- Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to all districts to increase compliance in the area of C to B transition timelines. The topic will be addressed in the following ways:
  - Self assessment training
  - Special Education Administrators Conference
  - New Director's Training
  - Web stream Presentations
  - DESE listserv message and/or webinar presentations

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

**Finalize and disseminate Part C to B Transition Module:** Missouri used State Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to develop and implement a comprehensive Transition Module addressing the Part C requirements as well as the significance to Early Childhood Special Education under Part B. The Part C to B Transition Module was completed in November 2007 and was posted on the web in December 2007.

**Targeted technical assistance:** Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants work with Division of Special Education supervisors to target the districts who need assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance supervisors notify RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of Part C to B timelines. The RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they develop strategies to correct the non-compliance.

**Ongoing training and technical assistance:** Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is required to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies' knowledge regarding students referred by Part C to B transition.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding students referred by Part C and having an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, a compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the New Director's Training.

The Division of Special Education website has web stream presentations that provide training on C to B transition. Finally, listserv messages by Division staff and webinar presentations by Assistant Commissioner, Heidi Atkins Lieberman, remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP. As noted above, one improvement activity regarding the Part C to Part B Transition Module has been completed.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

The state did not meet the 100% target for 2007-08, but had 82.5% compliance which is significant, continued improvement from the 44.8% and 73.2% in 2005-06 and 2006-07, respectively.

Data for this indicator were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state. There were 116 districts that completed a self-assessment in 2007-08.

The data represent 91 districts that had transition-age students with disabilities. Districts completed a file review on transition age students and answered the following questions for each student:

- Is there a measurable postsecondary goal or goals that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living?
- Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goals(s)?
- Are there transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?
- For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies with parent (or child once the age of majority is reached) consent, is there evidence that representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting?
- Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s)?
- Do the transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school?

The information is reviewed by Compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments, and the district calls are verified as correct or not.

Year	Number of Transition Plans Reviewed	Number that Met Standard	Percent that Met Standard
2005-06	460	206	44.8%
2006-07	508	372	73.2%
2007-08	537	443	<b>82.5%</b>

Source: Student file reviews (via IMACS) from a total of 116 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2007-08. A total of 91 of the 116 districts had transition-age students.

**Correction of previous noncompliance:** Fifty districts had findings of noncompliance related to this APR indicator issued in 2006-07. All districts were timely corrected and verified within one year of notification.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

While not meeting the 100% target, results for 2007-08 showed improvement of nearly 10% over the previous year, and continued improvement is anticipated due to extensive training and technical assistance available to districts on this topic.

In addition to improvement activities under SPP Indicator 1, improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Develop and implement training on secondary transition planning
- Targeted technical assistance to districts with poor compliance results to determine and correct causes

Discussion of the improvement activities follows. These activities are in addition to all the activities reported under SPP Indicator 1. All transition-related activities involve the development of compliant IEP transition plans. The following are more specific to the compliance aspects of the transition checklist.

**Training on secondary transition planning:** A series of regular trainings on transition planning was conducted by the RPDC Consultants. The information was disseminated through presentations, conferences, workshops and MSIP trainings. The state has contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary to provide training on the Transition Outcomes Projects (TOP). See Indicator 1 for more information.

**Targeted technical assistance to districts:** Each district with noncompliance in transition has received targeted technical assistance in correcting noncompliance related to indicator 13 through the Division of Special Education Compliance Supervisors and/or RPDC Compliance Consultants.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to the targets in the SPP. One improvement activity dealing with the Transition Outcomes Project has been moved from SPP 1 to SPP 13. Also, see SPP Indicator 1 for revisions to other improvement activities.



## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	74.0% of youth who had IEPs, will have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

With 74.6% of students exiting secondary school either competitively employed and/or enrolled in postsecondary school, Missouri met the target established for 2007-08.

Missouri has had a post-graduate follow-up data collection system in place for all students for several years. The collection includes a break-out of students with disabilities who had graduated the previous year. Districts are required to report these data six months post-graduation. Since districts are required to report on all graduates, no sampling is used for this segment of this indicator. These data are used in the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) for district accreditation purposes as well as in Special Education monitoring. Through this data collection, districts report the numbers of students who attend 4-year colleges, 2-year colleges or other post-secondary education training (i.e. technical schools), are competitively employed, are in the military, or are involved in other activities. The graduate follow-up data show little fluctuation from year to year. Districts are contacted if the follow-up for students with disabilities does not match the number that graduated the previous year. Due to the stability of these data, these data are considered valid and reliable.

In order to obtain follow-up data for dropouts, Missouri is utilizing information gained through state mandated reporting for all dropouts (disabled and non-disabled) to a Dropout Hotline. School districts are required to report all dropouts to the Hotline, and these would include students who reached maximum age, received a certificate or GED in place of a diploma or dropped out. The data from the Dropout Hotline was matched against the Missouri Student Identification System (MOSIS) data and assessment data to determine which of the dropouts were students with disabilities. This list was then matched against statewide databases, including economic development and higher education. These data were used to compile the percentage of dropouts who are employed or continuing education in the year following exit from high school.

Access to the higher education and economic development databases is made possible through the "P-20 Council" in which the commissioners of the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education, Higher Education and Economic Development meet regularly and have agreements to share information.

**Competitive Employment:** Missouri's definition of "competitive employment" in state regulations [34 361.5(b)(11)] is...work (i) In the competitive labor market that is performed on a full-time or part-time

basis in an integrated setting; and (ii) For which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals who are not disabled.

In the data collection for this indicator there is no distinction between full-time and part-time employment.

**Post-secondary Education:** The definition of post-secondary education for this report includes 4-year colleges, 2-year colleges or other post-secondary education training (i.e. technical schools) that students are attending either full or part-time. In the data collection for this indicator there is no distinction between full-time and part-time enrollment.

For more information on the definitions of graduates and dropouts, please see Indicator 1.

#### Graduate Follow-up Data

	2005-06 Graduates		2006-07 Graduates	
	#	%	#	%
4 - Year College	771	12.3%	810	12.5%
2 - Year College	1,555	24.9%	1,661	25.6%
Non – College	431	6.9%	366	5.6%
Military	198	3.2%	195	3.0%
Employment	2,290	36.6%	2,351	36.2%
Other	497	7.9%	516	8.0%
Unknown	510	8.2%	589	9.1%
Total Employed / Continuing Education	5,245	83.9%	5,383	83.0%
Total Follow-up	6,252	100.0%	6,488	100.0%

Source: District reported data on Core Data Screen 08

Total Employed & Continuing Education = Sum of (4-year and 2-year college, non-college, military and employment)

#### Dropout Follow-up Data

	06-07 Dropouts
Dropouts for whom follow-up could be conducted	313
Dropouts employed or continuing education	161
Percent of dropouts employed or continuing education	51.4%

In order to adjust the baseline data for the limited amount of dropout follow-up, the percentages of graduates and dropouts employed or continuing education were applied to the total number of graduates and dropouts from 2006-07.

#### Total Follow-up Data

	Total Exiters	Percent employed or continuing education (from tables above)	Adjusted total employed or continuing education = Total x Percent employed or continuing education
2006-07 Graduates	6,621	83.0%	5,495
2006-07 Dropouts	2,403	51.4%	1,235
2006-07 Graduates and Dropouts	9,024		6,730

Thus the percent of exiters that were employed or continuing education within one year of leaving secondary school is  $6,730 / 9,024 = 74.6\%$ .

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The state met the target for 2007-08.

In addition to improvement activities under SPP Indicator 1, improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Improve follow-up collection for dropouts through work with other DESE staff and use of MOSIS data

Discussion of the improvement activity follows. This activity is in addition to all the activities reported under SPP Indicator 1.

**Follow-up collection for dropouts:** This was the second year for which follow-up data for dropouts was compiled, and the results were not as extensive as anticipated. Student information from Missouri's Dropout Hotline for 2006-07 had to be crossed with information from the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) and Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) in order to determine which students were students with disabilities and to determine that the dropouts had not returned to school after having been reported as a dropout.

The ability to determine which dropouts had IEPs was limited by the MAP assessment pre-code information, and this resulted in only 313 students with disabilities for which follow-up could be conducted. These numbers should increase dramatically for the 2007-08 dropouts. 2007-08 was the first year that individual student exit data were reported to DESE through MOSIS so we will no longer need to use the Dropout Hotline data or the assessment pre-code information for matching purposes. The MOSIS data include IEP status and exit status at the individual student level. Therefore, while the data gathered on 2006-07 dropouts is very limited, the data collection will improve dramatically to the point where virtually all dropouts will be followed up on every year.

In addition to the existing method of data collection, the KU Transition Coalition will review the Indicator 14 data and data collection procedures as well as the data collection of three other states from the National Post-School Outcome Center. Working with the DESE staff, strengths and weaknesses of the Missouri Indicator 14 data collection measures and procedures will be identified during 2008-09.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to the targets in the SPP. See SPP Indicator 1 for revisions to improvement activities.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 15:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Missouri met the 100% target for correction of non-compliance within twelve months. This is an increase over the 95.4% of correction of noncompliance within 12 months reported in the previous APR.

A total of 109 districts, 8 charter schools, and 5 other state agencies and State Board operated programs were monitored, and had reports issued during 2006-07, resulting in a total of 122 districts/agencies. The Special Education monitoring follows the five-year accreditation cycle for the state of Missouri. Every district is reviewed once within the five year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). For more information on the Special Education monitoring process, please see the APR Overview titled 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle Focus on State Performance Plan Indicators. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # of LEAs issued findings in 2006-07 – the total number of agencies that had findings of noncompliance issued in 2006-07
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2006-07 – the total number of monitoring indicators and/or dispute resolution allegations found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance in an SPP indicator area
- # of Findings for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts
- % of findings with correction within one year – the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs issued findings in 2006-07	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2006-07	(b) # of Findings from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification	% of findings with correction within one year (b)/(a)
1, 2, 13*, 14: Secondary Transition	Monitoring: On-site visits, self-assessment, desk review, etc.	50	181	181	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints & Hearings		0	0	NA
3, 7: Statewide assessment and early childhood outcomes	Monitoring	50	144	144	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		12	12	100.0%
4A: Discipline	Monitoring	5	43	43	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		9	9	100.0%
5, 6: Educational environments/placements	Monitoring	35	174	174	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		8	8	100.0%
8: Parent Involvement	Monitoring	56	279	279	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		17	17	100.0%
9, 10: Disproportionality	Monitoring	0	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution		0	0	NA
11*: Initial evaluations	Monitoring	27	206	206	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		8	8	100.0%
12*: Part C to Part B Transition	Monitoring	10	24	24	100.0%
	Dispute Resolution		0	0	NA
Total			1,105	1,105	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Data included in this chart for Indicators 11, 12 and 13 are also reported separately under those indicators. The data in this table include findings of noncompliance with requirements related to the Indicators.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

Missouri met the target for this indicator in that 100% of the noncompliance identified in 2006-07 was timely corrected and verified within one year of the notification. The marked improvement in timely correction of noncompliance over the past two years is largely a result of making this SPP indicator a high priority and implementing the improvement activities discussed below.

**Correction of noncompliance from previous APR:** As reported in the last APR, 95.4% of findings of noncompliance from 2005-06 was timely corrected and verified within one year of notification with the remainder corrected by December 3, 2007.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system that
  - Identifies procedural noncompliance
  - Corrects identified noncompliance in a timely manner
  - Focuses on performance of students with disabilities
  - Includes a system of rewards and sanctions
- Implement targeted technical assistance that will enable districts to
  - Effectively and efficiently meet compliance requirements
  - Progress toward meeting the targets for student performance in the SPP
- Implement a regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans
- Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes
- Assign a staff person to coordinate follow-up reviews to ensure that they are completed in a timely manner.
- Generate and review monthly reports of districts with remaining noncompliance in order to implement activities to correct the noncompliance within 12 months.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Revise and implement a comprehensive general supervision system:** As the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) prepared to enter into a new Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) five year monitoring cycle, which began in 2006-07, the Division of Special Education worked closely with National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and several groups of stakeholders on focused monitoring procedures. As described in the APR Overview, the procedures focus strongly on the SPP performance areas by establishing criteria for Graduation and Dropout Rates, Performance on Statewide Assessments and LRE. Districts not meeting the established criteria are required to complete both a self-assessment file review using related compliance indicators and an improvement plan related to those performance areas. Results of the self assessment (file review) are verified through a Division of Special Education desk review, and Improvement Plans are also reviewed using a scoring guide developed with the assistance of the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC). See the APR overview for a description of focused monitoring on-site reviews in 4<sup>th</sup> cycle. This monitoring system rewards districts that are demonstrating solid performance in key SPP areas.

In addition to the focused file review, we require file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data, and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. In addition, we collect data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitor for compliance in these areas. Corrective Action Plans are required for any identified non-compliance, and this must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web based monitoring system (IMACS) and more frequent contact by RPDC consultants and DESE supervisors. Districts are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken when they attend the required self assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of non-compliance. Districts must also correct findings of non-compliance on an individual child basis, and follow up procedures are in place to monitor this as well.

The monitoring/general supervision system is also closely linked with the Department's MSIP process, which is tied to district accreditation. Results of special education monitoring, including results of data

reviews and improvement planning, are hi-lighted in the district's MSIP report. This is important, because the MSIP report receives a high level of attention from the district, the local board of education and the community.

**Implement targeted technical assistance:** Many strategies are in place to provide technical assistance to districts that were required to provide evidence of correction of non-compliance within 12 months. Emphasis is placed upon ensuring that DESE compliance supervisors have a heightened awareness of the districts that have need of technical assistance in order to correct non-compliance. An agenda item in daily staff meetings with compliance supervisors addresses districts that are out of compliance, and the progress being made with those districts to correct their non-compliance. When a supervisor encounters difficulty in providing the technical assistance to a district via phone or email, the RPDC compliance consultant assigned to the district is contacted and asked to make a personal visit to the district to provide assistance.

In the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle Monitoring training and other state-wide conferences such as the Special Education Administrator's Conference emphasis is placed upon state targets to ensure districts that are preparing for their MSIP review understand the importance placed upon meeting targets for students' performance. Fourth Cycle Monitoring training maintains its focus upon the importance of correction of non-compliance.

**Implement a regional support system:** DESE has five regional compliance consultants across the state. These consultants work with districts that have remaining noncompliance as well as providing training and technical assistance on compliance standards and indicators to all districts. Each district with identified noncompliance is assigned to a compliance consultant who assists the districts in correcting the noncompliance as soon as possible after the district receives the report, but in no case later than 12 months after the date of the report.

Communication between compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants provides a stronger base for the regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans. Updates about the status of districts' correction of non-compliance are provided to RPDC consultants through meetings, email, and telephone. RPDC compliance consultants work diligently with the compliance supervisors to implement IMACS so that the evidence of correction of non-compliance can be submitted smoothly by districts.

The staff has found the regional support system to be very effective and will continue its implementation.

**Implement web-based system for monitoring and self-assessment purposes:** The IMACS is the web-based monitoring management system used to monitor the districts' evidence of correction of non-compliance. The system is designed to provide timely feedback to districts as they provide documentation for evidence of correction to compliance supervisors. Daily staff meetings with compliance supervisors and weekly phone calls with the contracted company, Leader Services, has improved the implementation of IMACS and has increased its usability for districts. Staff will continue to work closely with Leader and districts to provide a comprehensive system to monitor correction of non-compliance.

**Assign a staff person to coordinate follow-up reviews:** The assistant director and data specialist of the Compliance section have worked closely to communicate to compliance supervisors when district timelines are approaching for correction of non-compliance in 12 months. This communication and hard work has resulted in 100% of correction of non-compliance within 12 months in our state. The system we have put in place has been successful and we plan to continue this coordination of follow-up reviews.

**Generate and review monthly reports of districts:** The compliance data specialist generates regular data reports to track correction of non-compliance. These reports are used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months such as phone calls, letters and other contacts with district administration. These actions ensure that the corrections are made and verified within one year of notification. Staff find the generation of data reports to track correction of non-compliance effective and will continue to use these reports for that purpose.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 16:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the state.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:** Percent =  $[(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \text{ divided by } 1.1] \text{ times } 100$ .

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines.

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Missouri met the target of 100% of complaints resolved within 60 days or appropriately extended timelines.

**Child Complaints**

School Year	Total Child Complaints Filed	Total Reports Issued	Total Child Complaints Within 60 Days	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions	Percent resolved within 60 days or extended timelines
2005-06	104	92	76	16	0	100.0%
2006-07	99	81	75	6	0	100.0%
2007-08	77	63	57	6	0	<b>100.0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines
- Continue to conduct and analyze participant satisfaction/feedback surveys

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

**Maintain compliance with timelines:** DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary. In September 2007, the division staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints.



**Satisfaction/feedback surveys:** Surveys are mailed to each individual who has filed a child complaint with the division. These surveys are used to analyze the process used when investigating child complaints and to report required data to OSEP. If after reviewing the data from the survey, division staff determines improvements can be made to the child complaint process, those improvements will be made. At this time the results of the surveys do not indicate areas for improvement and therefore, the surveys will be eliminated in 2008-09 based on advice from the Special Education Advisory Panel.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

As indicated above, the satisfaction feedback survey improvement activity will be eliminated based on advice from the Special Education Advisory Panel.

An improvement activity to continue maintaining the complaint system web training has been added to the SPP.

These revisions were presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 17:** Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:** Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Only one due process complaint that was filed during 2007-08 had been fully adjudicated by June 30, 2008. That due process hearing was adjudicated within timelines resulting in meeting the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.

**Due Process Hearing Requests**

Year	Fully Adjudicated Hearings (by June 30)	Fully Adjudicated Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension	Percent Fully Adjudicated within 45 Days or Extended Timeline
2005-06	2	0	100.0%
2006-07	3	0	100.0%
2007-08	1	0	<b>100.0%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator when considering due process complaints filed during 2007-08.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Continue current procedures to maintain compliance with timelines
- Continue to conduct and analyze participant satisfaction/feedback surveys

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

**Maintain compliance with timelines:** DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for due process hearings. Reports are monitored to ensure that appropriate extensions are made when necessary. Staff completed a web based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system in September 2007 which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for due process.

**Satisfaction/feedback surveys:** When a due process is withdrawn, surveys are mailed to each individual who has filed a due process with DESE. These surveys are used to analyze the reasons for withdrawal of due process complaints and to report required data to OSEP. If after reviewing the data from the survey, division staff determines improvements can be made to the due process complaint

process, those improvements will be made. At this time the results of the surveys do not indicate areas for improvement and therefore, the surveys will be eliminated in 2008-09 based on advice from the Special Education Advisory Panel.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

As indicated above the satisfaction feedback survey improvement activity will be eliminated based on advice from the Special Education Advisory Panel.

An improvement activity to continue maintaining the complaint system web training has been added to the SPP.

These revisions were presented to and accepted by the SEAP in December 2008.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 18:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Measurement:** Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	35% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Missouri met the target of 35% established for the 2007-08 school year.

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Resolution Sessions	32	52	41
Settlement Agreements	15	24	20
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%	<b>48.8%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

The data for 2007-08 indicates a slight increase from the previous year in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. The state met the target for this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Continue to collaborate with PTI to disseminate training and technical assistance for parents and LEAs regarding resolution sessions

Discussion of this improvement activity follows:

An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and division staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state. It is also available upon request to any person or organization, free of charge and is posted on the division website.

A web based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system was completed in September 2007. The training includes a description of the due process system, including resolution sessions.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

## Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 19:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	35% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

**Actual Target Data for 2007-08:**

Missouri met the 2007-08 target with 64.7% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.

	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations Held	Percent with Agreements
2005-06	4	6	66.7%
2006-07	15	27	55.5%
2007-08	11	17	<b>64.7%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

With 64.7% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35% for 2007-08.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Continue to collaborate with PTI to disseminate training and technical assistance for parents and LEAs regarding mediations

Discussion of the improvement activity follows:

An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and division staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state. It is also available upon request to any person or organization, free of charge and is posted on the division website.

A web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system was completed in September 2007. The training includes a description of the due process system, including resolution sessions.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to targets or improvement activities in the SPP.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-08

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 20:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Report data, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2007-08	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

#### Actual Target Data for 2007-08:

Missouri's score of 100% met the target for the requirement to submit timely and accurate data.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- MOSIS – Missouri Student Information System is a newly implemented student level collection system for the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. MOSIS is taking the previous Core Data Collection system to the student level. The data are aggregated and used for the Section 618 child count, placement, exiting, discipline and personnel reporting. These data are also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14. MOSIS includes a variety of data edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy of data
- Core Data Collection System – Core Data is a web-based system used to collect data from districts. Most of the collections for student data are now being populated with data from the MOSIS system. The collections populated with MOSIS data continue to utilize edit checking logic as a second screening of the data
- Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) – MAP data are used by the Department for NCLB/AYP reporting and district accreditation purposes, among others. Pre-coding of student information and a demographic clean-up window ensures accurate information. MAP data are used for the Section 618 Assessment table and for APR Indicator 3
- IMACS – the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System is used to gather data through special education monitoring self-assessments. Data collected through IMACS and verified by desk review include Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Transition Plans (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15)
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 15-19

## APR – Part B

## Missouri

- Other - The data collections for Early Childhood Outcomes (APR 7) and Parent Involvement (APR 8) are described in the respective SPP or APR sections.

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2007-08. The results are below:

APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1	NA	1
2	1	NA	1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
Subtotal			38
Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)			5
Grand Total			43

618 Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	NA	3
Subtotal					23
Weighted Total (subtotal x 1.87)					43

	Points Earned	Points Possible	Percent of Timely and Accurate Data
APR Total	43	43	100%
618 Total	43	43	100%
Grand Total	86	86	100%

As indicated above, state reported data for 2007-08 were submitted in a timely fashion and were accurate as defined by OSEP's scoring rubric.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-08:**

Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2007-08.

The Division continues with data verification efforts as described in the SPP.

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the new MOSIS collection system which populated the web-based Core Data Collection System. A manual with reporting instructions, and data edits are important features of both the MOSIS and Core Data systems. New special education directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Division staff. The end-of-year collections for 2007-08 were the first special education collections to be collected solely through MOSIS. Division staff worked extensively with districts to ensure the accuracy of the data collected at the student level
- Data editing and validation are handled by Division staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts
- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are now also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting
- Staff in the Division serve as active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department. The Core Data Team has ensured that the shift to student-level collections through MOSIS is successful and that the data needs of the various DESE programs are met
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data
- Data gathered through IMACS all undergo verification by Compliance Supervisors, and the Supervisors' determinations supersede district responses if different

These efforts have allowed the Division to identify and correct many errors made by districts when submitting special education data. Due to this, most errors are corrected prior to federal data submissions.

Improvement activities for 2007-08 included the following:

- Continue involvement with development of Missouri's Student Information System (MOSIS)
- Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and district superintendents to discuss data accuracy and use
- Build data analysis into improvement planning process through a needs assessment
- Increase involvement in work with Center for Data Quality (C4DQ)

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

**Missouri's Student Information System (MOSIS):** As noted above, the DESE and Division are moving forward with student level data collection, and the first mandatory student-level MOSIS submissions were in the spring of 2008. Division staff is part of a DESE workgroup that is identifying and



defining the necessary data elements to be collected. The Division staff has worked closely with other DESE staff to ensure that definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent.

**Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and district superintendents to discuss data accuracy and use:** While discussions specific to this topic have not been held, the topic is embedded in most trainings and conversations that involve the special education system of general supervision. District and DESE personnel are aware that data are being used to trigger requirements for self-assessment purposes, select districts for on-site reviews, report to the public and provide local Determinations to districts, among other things. All of these endeavors have emphasized the importance of data accuracy.

**Build data analysis into improvement planning process through a needs assessment:** See the APR Overview regarding Improvement Planning (page 4). The first step in the improvement planning process is a data-based needs assessment. The training for the improvement plan includes information and examples of a quality needs assessment. The training stresses that accurate data is the basis for a quality needs assessment, and that utilizing data to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses will, at times, result in uncovering inaccurate data. Therefore, training districts to conduct a data-based needs assessment will result in more accurate data. In addition, the scoring guide for the improvement plans provides points for the following:

- Methodology of drilldown process and data sources used are appropriate and described in sufficient detail
- Hypothesized root causes in needed areas of improvement are identified through data analysis
- The needs of the district are identified and prioritized through data analysis

**Center for Data Quality (C4DQ) Involvement:** The basic purpose of the involvement with C4DQ is to make more information available to districts regarding the accuracy of data submitted to the DESE. At the SEA level, C4DQ makes it much easier to add or update data edit checks which are then applied to district data. Involvement with C4DQ has been minimal during 2007-08, due to the implementation of the student level data collections through MOSIS. MOSIS has focused on facilitating the submission of data by the districts as well as up-front edit checks to screen the data prior to it being certified by the districts.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-08:**

No revisions were made to the targets or improvement activities in the SPP.